

MAY 14 2007

Application No. 10/658,151

Reply to Office Action

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful consideration given the present patent application and for the indication of allowable subject matter. Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action dated November 13, 2006, and the references applied therein. In response, applicants have amended claims 28, 30, and 56. Applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration in light of the following remarks is requested.

With respect to the Section 112 rejection, claim 30 has been amended, as suggested in the Office Action, to depend from claim 29. Withdrawn claim 56 has been amended to depend from allowed claim 38. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 56 and 57 are in condition for allowance.

Turning now to the substantive rejections, the rejection of previously presented claim 1 is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 recites a vehicle including a storage and dispensing apparatus that includes front and rear ends, first and second side walls, first and second common walls, a bottom, and an intermediate base that define a liquid containment vessel having first and second side sections disposed between the first side wall and the first common wall and the second side wall and the second common wall, respectively, and a connecting section disposed between the first and second side sections between the bottom and the base. Doherty fails to teach or suggest a vehicle combination as recited in claim 1.

For example, Doherty fails to teach or suggest a storage and dispensing apparatus having a liquid containment vessel with a connecting section disposed between the first and second side sections and between the bottom and the base. FIG. 2 of Doherty, a rear-end view of a second embodiment of a vehicle, is described as including "a granular hopper, liquid storage tanks, spreader disk, and two liquid spray bars, one for pre-wetting and one for direct application." Column 3, lines 28-32. Doherty makes no mention of any mechanism for connecting the liquid storage tanks.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the description in Doherty does not include an inherent teaching of a connecting section as claimed in claim 1. There is no discussion in Doherty concerning the dangerousness of the vehicle if the liquid stored in the two tanks is not equalized. Even if Doherty suggested some kind of connecting section, there is nothing in

Application No. 10/658,151

Reply to Office Action

Doherty that makes it clear that such connecting section is necessarily present between the first and second side sections between the bottom and the base. *See Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co.*, 945 F.2d 1264, 1268, 20 USPQ2d 1746, 1749 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

As such, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Doherty. Claims 2-5, 7, 10-19, and 21-32 depend from claim 1 and contain the same patentable features thereof.

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Fikkin, Reg. No. 51,677
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: May 14, 2007